

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1, 3, 7-9, 11 and 15 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-15 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1, 7- 9 and 15 are independent claims. Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 2, 4-6, 10, and 12-14 contain allowable subject matter.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments do not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification. Support for the amendments may be found at least in paragraph 0024 of the specification as shown in U. S. Patent Application Publication No. U.S. 2004/0160168.

Entry of the Amendments and Remarks is respectfully requested because entry of Amendment places the present application in condition for allowance, or in the alternative, better form for appeal. No new matters are believed to be added by these Amendments. In view of the above amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3, 7-9, 11, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,121,950 issued to Zavracky, *et al.* ("Zavracky"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In order for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) to be proper, a single reference must disclose every claimed feature. To be patentable, a claim need only recite a single novel feature that is not disclosed in the cited reference. Thus, the failure of a cited reference to disclose one or more claimed features renders the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection improper.

First, while claim 3 stands rejected on the basis of 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in the Office Action, the Office Action does not address the limitations of dependent claim 3 apart from independent claim 1, from which claim 3 depends. Specifically, the Office Action does not show how Zavracky discloses the limitations of claim 3. Similarly, while claim 11 stands rejected on the basis of 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in the Office Action, the Office Action does not address the limitations of dependent claim 11 apart from independent claim 9, from which claim 11 depends. Specifically, the Office Action does not show how Zavracky discloses the limitations of claim 11. Accordingly, Applicants assert that the Office Action is incomplete and the rejections of claims 3 and 11 are improper.

Claim 1 as amended recites, *inter alia*, an apparatus with a “display controller for using a current value fed back from the second electrode of the display panel.” Zavracky does not teach such features. Rather, in Zavracky, feedback signals are provided to a video polarity network from “at least one temperature sensor 92 and at least one light sensor 94.” See Zavracky, col. 13, lines 24-25. Further, Zavracky does not teach or disclose any connection of a temperature sensor or a light sensor to an electrode of the display panel. Even where a temperature sensor or light sensor is physically positioned in the vicinity of a second electrode, current from a temperature sensor or light sensor does not anticipate “a current value fed back from the second electrode” (emphasis added). Accordingly, Zavracky does not teach a “current value fed back from the second electrode of the display panel.”

Claims 7-9 and 15 contain similar limitations as claim 1. Claim 7 as amended recites, *inter alia*, “current value fed back from at least one second electrode.” Claim 8 as amended recites, *inter alia*, “current value fed back from the second electrode.” Claim 9 as amended recites, *inter alia*, “current value fed back from an electrode of the display panel.” Claim 15 as

amended recites, *inter alia*, “current value fed back from an electrode of a display panel.” As asserted above regarding claim 1, these limitations are not taught by Zavracky.

Since none of the other prior art of record discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 7- 9 and 15, and all the claims that depend therefrom are allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 1, 3, 7-9, 11 and 15.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 2, 4-6, 10, and 12-14 contain allowable subject matter.


CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submits that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: February 28, 2006

CUSTOMER NO. 58027
H.C. Park & Associates, PLC
8500 Leesburg Pike
Suite 7500
Vienna, VA 22182
Tel: 703-288-5105
Fax: 703-288-5139
HCP/WMH/alj